vdl

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/973,108	10/09/2001	Gary G. Stringham	10008001-1	5583

7590   05/17/2005

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER
DIVINE, LUCAS

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2624	

DATE MAILED: 05/17/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	**Applicant(s)**
Office Action Summary	09/973,108	STRINGHAM, GARY G.
	Examiner	**Art Unit**	
	Lucas Divine	2624	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>09 October 2001</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-22* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-11,14-17 and 20-22* is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) *12,13,18 and 19* is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>09 October 2001</u> is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☒ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1.   The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they

include the following reference character(s) not mentioned in the description: **148**. Corrected

drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d), or amendment to the specification to add

the reference character(s) in the description in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(b) are required in

reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement

drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the

sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing

date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New

Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the

applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office

action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the

basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2.   Claims 1, 2, 4 – 11, 14 – 17, and 20 – 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being

anticipated by Blanchard, Jr. et al. (US 4923314) hereafter as Blanchard.

Regarding claim 1, Blanchard teaches **a print apparatus** (Fig. 1, details shown in later

Figs.) **adapted to provide a thesaurus feature** (85, Fig. 3), **said print apparatus comprising:**

a print module (carrier 18 includes drivers and physical elements 56, 48, 60, and 58

work together to print the inputted document; col. 5 lines 16-20 and col. 4 lines 37-39) **for**

printing a document file (document read from RAM 102; col. 5 line 17 and col. 4 lines 33-34);

a processor coupled to said print module (processor 68 is coupled to the print module

through slave processor 98, see Fig. 3), **said processor controlling said print module** (master

processor 68 runs the entire apparatus, including driving the print module - slave processor 98

handles the lower level tasks of receiving commands and controlling each individual driver);

a memory device coupled to said processor (ROM 82), **said memory device storing a**

thesaurus program (thesaurus control software 85, col. 4 lines 5-9); **and**

wherein said processor executes said thesaurus program stored in said memory

device (col. 4 lines 4-6, wherein the master microprocessor 68 controls the system including

elements of ROM 82, further discussed in col. 4 line 54 – col. 5 line 15).

Regarding claim 2, which depends from claim 1, Blanchard further teaches **a control**

panel coupled to said processor (Fig. 3, keyboard 12 controls the device and is coupled through

input buffer 74 to master microprocessor 68), **said control panel enabling user control of said**

processor (all user control in the system is via the keyboard, for example, the thesaurus editing

is done by using the function and other keys of the keyboard; col. 5 lines 57-58); **and,**

a display unit coupled to said processor (Fig. 3, display and driver 104, which is coupled to processor 68 through lines 106), said display unit displaying a set of display information generated by said processor during execution of said thesaurus program (col. 5 lines 46-56), and said display unit further displaying said document file (display unit 104 displays the document file 16 characters at a time as the dictionary and thesaurus programs are being used upon that grouping of words).

Regarding claim 4, which depends from claim 1, Blanchard further teaches an editor program stored in said memory device (ROM 82 holds program files for the system, inherently including the software to execute the editing of the file – see col. 5 lines 57-67, wherein the user presses function key 108 to enter into the editor mode, wherein the thesaurus can be used, otherwise, editor mode is not used and the document is printed as types), said editor program enabling said user to edit said document file (Figs. 4-6 detail editing steps that are used in conjunction with the thesaurus software to edit the file for printing).

Regarding claim 5, which depends from claim 4, Blanchard further teaches editor program is integrated with said thesaurus program such that, while said editor program is being executed, a set of features associated with said thesaurus program are selectable by said user without having to separately invoke said thesaurus program (editor inherently is integrated with the dictionary and thesaurus modes [See Fig. 4 which details editor steps, both spell check and thesaurus are used in conjunction], the user enters the selection of the thesaurus function [col. 5 lines 57-58] and the editor must be automatically opened because the thesaurus is integrated such that the thesaurus feature works through the editor software).

Regarding claim 6, which depends from claim 1, Blanchard further teaches **said**

processor comprises a first processor (master processor inherently includes separate

processing elements for separate features of the system, for example, one Input/Output

processing element for handling input from the keyboard *[second processor]* and one for

executing editing tasks, such as the thesaurus *[first processor]*) **and wherein said first**

processor executes said thesaurus program in response to a signal generated by a second

processor (first processing element inherently runs the editing software including the thesaurus

control software 85, which would be initiated by a signal from second [input/output] processing

part in order to activate the thesaurus program) **that is communicatably coupled to said print**

apparatus (as part of master processor 68, both processing elements are coupled to the system).

Regarding claim 7, which depends from claim 6, Blanchard further teaches that **first**

processor further causes a set of display information generated while executing said

thesaurus program to be supplied to said second processor for display by a display unit

coupled to said second processor (*first processor* as discussed above would control the

thesaurus software and thus would have to supply the display output to the I/O processing

element *second processor* in order to be output on display 104).

Regarding claim 8, which depends from claim 7, Blanchard further teaches **memory**

device comprises a first memory device and wherein said document file is stored in a

second memory device coupled to said second processor (document file is stored in second

memory device 102 [col. 5 line 17]which is coupled to all processors in the system through bus

lines).

Regarding claim 9, which depends from claim 7, Blanchard further teaches **executing said thesaurus program, responds to data received from said second processor** (the thesaurus processing part [*first processor* as discussed above] inherently must receive inputted data from the I/O processing part [*second processor*]).

Regarding claim 10, which depends from claim 1, Blanchard further teaches **a reformatter driver for formatting said document for printing by said print module** (slave microprocessor 98 acts as a reformatter by taking data to be printed and generating the necessary signals [reformatting] from the data to drive the physical element drivers shown in Fig. 3).

Regarding claim 11, Blanchard teaches **a method for a processor disposed in a print apparatus, said method comprising the steps of:**

a) executing a thesaurus program for enhancing terminology in a document file (thesaurus control software 85);

b) enabling editing of said document file to incorporate one or more of a set of terms identified via execution of said thesaurus program (Figs. 4-6 show the editing steps, including steps 221 and 224, which incorporate terms identified via the execution of the thesaurus to put into the document file);

c) saving said document file having said one or more of said set of terms incorporated therein as a revised document file in a memory device (final document for outputting is stored in memory 102; col. 5 lines 17 and col. 4 lines 33-37); **and,**

d) causing a print module to print said revised document file (col. 5 lines 16-19).

Regarding claim 14, which depends from claim 11, Blanchard further teaches **processor**

comprises a first processor (master processor inherently includes separate processing elements

for separate features of the system, for example, one Input/Output processing element for

handling input from the keyboard *[second processor]* and one for executing editing tasks, such

as the thesaurus *[first processor]*)**, and wherein step a) through step d) are performed by said**

first processor (editing processing part *first* processor) **in response to signals received from a**

second processor that is communicatably coupled to said first processor (the thesaurus

processing part *[first processor* as discussed above] inherently must receive inputted data from

the I/O processing part [*second processor*])**.**

Regarding claim 15, which depends from claim 11, Blanchard further teaches **converting**

said revised version of said document file to a print ready format before causing said print

module to print said revised version of said document file (slave microprocessor 98 takes data

to be printed and converts the data to the necessary signals from the data to drive the physical

element drivers shown in Fig. 3)**.**

Regarding claim 16, which depends from claim 11, Blanchard further teaches **processor**

comprises a first processor (first processor 68)**, and wherein said method further comprises**

the step of informing a second processor (second processor 98) **that said revised version of**

said document file is available for uploading (in order to receive and store the revised version

for printing in RAM 102, the first processor must inherently send some sort of control signal to

the slave processor to notify it that data is going to be sent)**.**

Regarding claim 17, the program code steps in computer readable medium step 17 are the same steps as in method claim 11. Further, Blanchard teaches a processor 68 and memory 82 for the executing and storing of program code. Therefore, program code steps in a computer readable medium in claim 17 are rejected for the same reasons as stated above in the rejection of method claim 11.

Regarding claim 20, which depends from claim 17, the program code steps in computer readable medium step 20 are the same steps as in method claim 14. Further, Blanchard teaches a processor 68 and memory 82 for the executing and storing of program code. Therefore, program code steps in a computer readable medium in claim 20 are rejected for the same reasons as stated above in the rejection of method claim 14.

Regarding claim 21, which depends from claim 17, the program code steps in computer readable medium step 21 are the same steps as in method claim 15. Further, Blanchard teaches a processor 68 and memory 82 for the executing and storing of program code. Therefore, program code steps in a computer readable medium in claim 21 are rejected for the same reasons as stated above in the rejection of method claim 15.

Regarding claim 22, which depends from claim 17, the program code steps in computer readable medium step 22 are the same steps as in method claim 16. Further, Blanchard teaches a processor 68 and memory 82 for the executing and storing of program code. Therefore, program code steps in a computer readable medium in claim 22 are rejected for the same reasons as stated above in the rejection of method claim 16.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

3.   Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Blanchard as

applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Kuroda et al. (US 6094186) hereafter as Kuroda.

Regarding claim 3, which depends from claim 1, Blanchard teaches the memories 102

and 82 not the same.

Kuroda teaches a single memory for storing program data and document data in a

document processing device (Fig. 1 ref. no. 105, col. 3 lines 1-4)

Thus, ROM 100 and RAM 102 of Blanchard could have been located in one central

memory along with memory 82.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to place all of the memories

in the system in one memory device instead of multiple in order to reduce costs and to reduce

complexity. One larger memory that both processors access would cost less than plural small

ones and only one memory interface would have to be developed instead of many.

Allowable Subject Matter

4.   Claims 12, 13, 18, and 19 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim,

but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the

base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

5.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's

disclosure. US-5742834, Kobayashi, 8-21-1998: teaches a document processing apparatus using

a synonym dictionary.

6.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Lucas Divine whose telephone number is 571-272-7432. The

examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 7:30am - 5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, David Moore can be reached on 571-272-7437. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

KING Y. POON
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Lucas Divine
Examiner
Art Unit 2624

ljd